



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,386	12/21/2001	Richard Y. Chen	US 010700	4894

24737 7590 01/18/2006

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

WONG, ALLEN C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/028,386	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Allen Wong	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11-13,15-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-8,11-13,15-19 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/10/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. Regarding lines 10-16 on page 7 of applicant's remarks, applicant contends that there is no suggestion to combine and no prima facie case of obviousness established. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references or reasonable expectation of success, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wu, Mishima and Strongin as a whole for modifying Strongin's teaching of selecting the IDCT computation before the IDCT is performed so as to permit the selection of the DCT before the DCT computation is performed for producing optimized high quality picture characteristics, as disclosed in Strongin's column 4, lines 1-5.

Further, the combination of Wu, Mishima and Strongin is reasonable and useable together because Wu, Mishima and Strongin pertain to the same DCT and MPEG video image processing environment.

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding lines 1-2 on page 8 of applicant remarks about claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 18 and 21, applicant argues that the "selecting only one of the DCT modules for performing DCT computation based on factors including an available level of computing resource" is not disclosed by the combination of Wu, Mishima and Strongin. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Strongin teaches, in fig.6 and column 13, lines 33-65, that the selection is done by the selection circuit 640 to select the optimum IDCT unit based on the precision that each IDCT has, in that the bandwidth, quality level, computing resources, encoding bit rate and decoder capacity are taken into account before the IDCT selection circuit 640 chooses the optimum IDCT module for preparation of decoding image data for viewing. Thus, Strongin meets the deficiencies of Wu and Mishima.

Regarding lines 17-20 on page 8 of applicant's remarks about claims 3-7 and 10, applicant states that the combination of Wu, Mishima and Strongin does not disclose the above aforementioned features. The examiner respectfully disagrees. These reasons are already addressed in the above paragraphs and in the rejection below.

Thus, the rejection of the claims is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 8 and 18 are written in such a manner that a computer program product can be reasonably interpreted as containing

instructions to be listed as computer program coded language written on a piece of paper. Because of the ambiguous nature of the claims as currently written in the preamble of claims 8 and 18, claims 8 and 18 need to be produced in a tangible body, machine readable, and be non-function descriptive material, meaning that a compressed signal needs to be produced by a method, apparatus, arrangement or system. So claims 8 and 18 need to be cancelled to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection. The preamble needs to disclose "a computer-readable storage medium (media) storing computer program including executable instructions, the computer executes instructions comprising:". See MPEP 706.03(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu (6,614,936) in view of Mishima (5,488,418) and Strongin (5,872,866).

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 11, Wu discloses a program product stored on a recordable medium for encoding a layered video signal, the program product comprising:

means for receiving a video signal and outputting an encoded base layer stream (fig.9, element 82); and

means for encoding an enhancement layer (fig.9, element 84).

Although Wu does not specifically disclose wherein the enhancement layer encoding means includes a plurality of discrete cosine transform (DCT) modules and selection means for selecting only one of the DCT modules to perform a DCT computation, however, Mishima teaches the use of a plurality of discrete cosine transform (DCT) modules and selection means for selecting one of the DCT modules (fig.50B, Mishima discloses the use of multiple DCT modules 77 with a selection means 79 for selecting one of the appropriate DCT module from the plurality of DCT modules). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mishima's multiple DCT modules and selection means into Wu's enhancement layer coder for producing the enhancement layer encoding means includes a plurality of discrete cosine transform (DCT) modules and selection means for selecting one of the DCT modules so as to accurately, efficiently encode and decode image data with as few errors as possible during transmission while maintaining high image quality (Mishima col.6, ln.7-19).

Wu does not specifically disclose wherein each of the plurality of DCT modules comprises a different precision. However, Mishima teaches the use of a plurality of discrete cosine transform (DCT) modules and selection means for selecting one of the DCT modules (fig.50B, Mishima discloses the use of multiple DCT modules 77 with a selection means 79 for selecting only one of the appropriate DCT module from the plurality of DCT modules, wherein each DCT 77 comprises its own precision). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mishima's multiple DCT modules and selection means into Wu's

enhancement layer coder for producing the enhancement layer encoding means includes a plurality of discrete cosine transform (DCT) modules and selection means for selecting one of the DCT modules so as to accurately, efficiently encode and decode image data with as few errors as possible during transmission while maintaining high image quality (Mishima col.6, ln.7-19).

Neither Wu nor Mishima specifically discloses the selection is made before the DCT computation is performed based on at least one of an available level of computing resources, and encoding bit rate, a required quality level, a decoder capability and a bandwidth availability. However, Strongin teaches the selection is made before the IDCT computation is performed based on at least one of an available level of computing resources, and encoding bit rate, a required quality level, a decoder capability and a bandwidth availability (see fig.6, col.13, ln.33-65; note selection circuit 640 selects the optimum IDCT unit based on the precision that each IDCT has, in that the bandwidth, quality level, computing resources, encoding bit rate and decoder capacity are taken into account before the IDCT selection circuit 640 chooses the optimum IDCT module for preparation of decoding image data for viewing). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Wu, Mishima and Strongin as a whole for modifying Strongin's teaching of selecting the IDCT computation before the IDCT is performed so as to permit the selection of the DCT before the DCT computation is performed for producing optimized high quality picture characteristics (Strongin col.4, ln.1-5).

Regarding claims 4-7, Wu does not specifically disclose wherein the selection means selects one of the DCT modules based on one of the group consisting of: an available level of computing resources; an encoding bit rate; a required quality level; a decoder capability; and bandwidth availability. However, Mishima teaches wherein the selection means selects one of the DCT modules based on one of the group consisting of: an available level of computing resources (col.24, ln.23-33); an encoding bit rate (col.24, ln.23-33); a required quality level (col.24, ln.23-33); a decoder capability (col.24, ln.23-33); and bandwidth availability (col.24, ln.23-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mishima's multiple DCT modules and selection means into Wu's enhancement layer coder for producing the enhancement layer encoding means includes a plurality of discrete cosine transform (DCT) modules and selection means for selecting one of the DCT modules so as to accurately, efficiently encode and decode image data with as few errors as possible during transmission while maintaining high image quality (Mishima col.6, ln.7-19).

3. Claims 12, 13, 15-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bonet (6,510,177) in view of Strongin (5,872,866).

Regarding claims 12, 18 and 21, De Bonet discloses a program product stored on a recordable medium for decoding a layered video stream, comprising:

means for receiving and decoding a base layer video stream (fig.2, element 270);
and

means for receiving an enhancement layer video stream and generating a decoded enhanced video output (fig.2, element 280 is the enhancement layer decoder and note the enhanced video output is displayed on monitor 290).

Although De Bonet does not specifically disclose wherein the enhancement layer decoding means or means for receiving an enhancement layer video stream including: a plurality of inverse discrete cosine transform (IDCT) modules; and means for selecting one of the IDCT modules. However, Strongin teaches the use of a plurality of inverse discrete cosine transform (IDCT) modules; and means for selecting one of the IDCT modules (fig.6, elements 650-653 are the plural IDCT modules and element 640 is the selection means for selecting one of the IDCT modules). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Strongin's plural IDCT modules and selection means into De Bonet's enhancement layer decoder module for producing means for receiving an enhancement layer video stream including: a plurality of inverse discrete cosine transform (IDCT) modules; and means for selecting one of the IDCT modules so as to reduce the computational burden of the video decoding by selecting a highly efficient inverse discrete cosine transform which is optimized for particular picture characteristics (Strongin col.4, ln.1-5).

Regarding claims 13 and 19, De Bonet does not specifically disclose wherein each of the plurality of IDCT modules comprises a different precision. However, Strongin teaches wherein each of the plurality of IDCT modules comprises a different precision (col.13, ln.33-39; note selection circuit 640 selects the optimum IDCT unit

based on the precision that each IDCT has). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Strongin's plural IDCT modules and selection means into De Bonet's enhancement layer decoder module for producing means for receiving an enhancement layer video stream including: a plurality of inverse discrete cosine transform (IDCT) modules; and means for selecting one of the IDCT modules so as to reduce the computational burden of the video decoding by selecting a highly efficient inverse discrete cosine transform which is optimized for particular picture characteristics (Strongin col.4, ln.1-5).

Regarding claims 15-17, De Bonet does not specifically disclose wherein the selection means selects one of the IDCT modules based on one of the group consisting of: an available level of computing resources; an encoding bit rate; and a required quality level; a decoder capability; and bandwidth availability. However, Strongin teaches the selection means selects one of the IDCT modules based on one of the group consisting of: an available level of computing resources (col.13, ln.33-39); an encoding bit rate (col.13, ln.33-39); and a required quality level (col.13, ln.33-39); a decoder capability (col.13, ln.33-39); and bandwidth availability (col.13, ln.33-65; note selection circuit 640 selects the optimum IDCT unit based on the precision that each IDCT has, in that the bandwidth, quality level, computing resources, encoding bit rate and decoder capacity are taken into account before the IDCT selection circuit 640 chooses the optimum IDCT module for preparation of decoding image data for viewing). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Strongin's plural IDCT modules and selection means into De

Bonet's enhancement layer decoder module for producing means for receiving an enhancement layer video stream including: a plurality of inverse discrete cosine transform (IDCT) modules; and means for selecting one of the IDCT modules so as to reduce the computational burden of the video decoding by selecting a highly efficient inverse discrete cosine transform which is optimized for particular picture characteristics (Strongin col.4, ln.1-5).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7341. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 8am-6pm Flextime.

Art Unit: 2613

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Allen Wong
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2613

AW
1/12/06